arXiv:cond-mat/0306220v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 9 Jun 2003

Comment on *Conservative force fields in nonextensive kinetic theory*

F.A. da Costa * and M.D.S. de Meneses

Departamento de Física Teórica e Experimental
Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte
Caixa Postal 1641
59072-970, Natal, RN, Brazil

Abstract

We discuss an improper application of the Maxwell-Boltzmann theory to a very unrealistic model. The authors of the original paper claim that a generalized theory would solve a problem that really does not exists. This Comment was submited to Physica A and was not accepted as it is.

Key words: Boltzmann-Gibbs distribution, q-thermostatics, barometric formula
PACS: 05.20.Dd, 0.5.90.+m

In a recent paper Lima et al. [1] proposed to generalize the expression that describes how the density of an ideal gas varies with the height z, measured from the planet surface, in an *isothermal* planetary atmosphere. It is also assumed that the gravitational field is constant in the z-direction, so that the potential energy is simply $U(z) = mgz$. These simplified hypotheses lead to well-known barometric formula

$$\rho(z) = \rho_0 \exp\left[-\frac{mgz}{k_B T}\right] \ , \tag{1}$$

where ρ_0 is the gas density at the planet surface level ($z = 0$), m is the gas mass, k_B represents the Boltzmann constant and T is the absolute temperature.

In the wake of Tsallis [2] non-extensive q-Thermostatistics Lima et al. found Eq. (24) presented in their paper [1]. These authors claim that for suitable val-

* Corresponding Author
Email addresses: fcosta@dfte.ufrn.br (F.A. da Costa), mdurval@dfte.ufrn.br (M.D.S. de Meneses).

ues of q their expression would solve the problem of having an atmosphere that would extend to infinite. Actually, it is well known from elementary physics that there is really no such problem with respect to the Boltzmann distribution which leads to Eq. (1). Any book of physics for undergraduate students explains that there are *two fundamental hypotheses* behind Eq. (1), namely, that **both** g **and** T are constant as z varies from 0 to ∞. For typical heights $z \approx 10$ to $100km$ the error in g is of the order of 1%, so there is not a serious problem to assume a constant g. On the other hand, it is empirically known that the temperature falls approximately $5K$ as we go $1km$ higher, if we start from the earth surface. Thus one notes that as z goes from 0 up to $z = 25km$ the *isothermal* condition is **violated**, and we could not apply an equilibrium Boltzmann distribution to deduce Eq. (1). On this basis, the Table 1 presented in [1] is completely void of significance (we think there is problably a misprinting for the z_{max} of Oxygen when $q = 0.8$). Also, that Table gives figures for the Hydrogen and Oxygen gases. If the authors had considered the most abundant gases in our atmosphere, they would have found a somewhat better results *considering* $q = 0.7$, namely, $z_{max} = 18km$, and $29km$ for CO_2 and N_2, respectively. However, we were not able to find any criterion in their paper about the right choice for the value of the parameter q.

For pedagogical reasons we thing that any discussion relative to distances in this sort of problem should begin by considering the natural length scale for this problem, namely,

$$\xi = \frac{k_B T}{mg}.$$

Taking, for instance, $T = 300K$ we can easily obtain $\xi_{H_2} \approx 100km$, whereas $\xi \approx 10km$ for O_2, N_2 and CO_2.

In summary, contrary to the authors claim, there is really no problem with the Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution in the present context. The problem we are faced with in this case lies in the model which is *completely inappropriated* to discuss the question raised Lima et el. [1].

References

[1] J.A.S. Lima, J.R. Bezerra, R. Silva *Physica A 316 (2002) 289*

[2] C. Tsallis, *J. Stat. Phys. 52 (1988) 479*